

ITEMS

VOLUME 1 · NUMBER 3 · SEPTEMBER 1947
230 PARK AVENUE · NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

CURRENT PROBLEMS OF COUNCIL CONCERN

IN RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

*by Donald Young and Paul Webbink **

IN PART as an aftermath of World War II, there is now a widespread demand for permanent and effective organized support and direction of research in the natural sciences. With this is slowly developing a recognition that improved organization for research on problems of human behavior is fundamental to the development and maintenance of a well disposed society. The successes of the natural sciences in the years since 1939 have contributed to a pattern of thought favorable to a scientific approach to human problems. The terrifying destructive capacity of natural science inventions and the promise of their potentialities in the peaceful service of mankind have made obvious the need for improved methods of orderly adjustment to technological advance. The former common indifference to proposals for better research organization in the social sciences can not long withstand the impact of these forces combined with the advances which have been taking place in recent years in the research approaches and techniques of the social sciences themselves. A principal problem now facing social scientists is that of so organizing research that adequate facilities may become available for meeting their opportunities and responsibilities.

Organization for research in the social sciences does not imply skepticism concerning anticipated contributions from lone workers nor does it suggest a future reduction in the research role of the individual investi-

gator. It is traditional in the United States that research is an individual concern, and that the primary purpose of research organizations should be to supplement rather than supplant individual effort. It is assumed with good historical reason that the basic innovations in social science rarely emerge in the course of the extensive operations of large-scale projects; usually initiation of such projects has been stimulated by the product of some previous innovator working on a modest scale. It is to the lone worker that we shall continue to look for new ideas and pioneering studies; even much of the routine spadework of verifying the findings of others and filling in lacunae in our knowledge must be left in his care. It is a major function of research organization to make it possible for the individual to carry out effectively the tasks for which he is best equipped.

THE RESEARCH SITUATION IN UNIVERSITIES

American institutions of higher learning without exception have paid far more attention to the instruction of students than to the production of knowledge, particularly in the social sciences and the humanities. That instruction is the primary function of the universities can not be disputed, but teaching divorced from the extension of knowledge inevitably becomes archaic and sterile. The secondary and even incidental administrative attention and budgetary consideration given research in all but a few of even the greatest universities is just cause for criticism. Too few universities have wrestled earnestly with the problem of effecting a reasonable reconciliation between the teaching and research functions of educational institutions.

* This article was adapted by the authors from a longer paper entitled "Organization for Research in the Social Sciences" prepared by Donald Young for the American Council of Learned Societies in the summer of 1946.

There are many barriers to the conduct of research by social scientists who earn their living as members of educational faculties. The priority of teaching obligations always has placed limits upon research, but the postwar influx of unprecedented numbers of students into American colleges and universities has made the situation much more difficult than ever before. Current enrollments in social science courses seem to be proportionately heavier than in other areas of student specialization. Consultation with students, service on faculty committees, and other administrative duties take much of the time not needed for classroom instruction and its attendant obligations.

Prevailing low academic salaries not infrequently force men to spend their free time in remunerative employment rather than in research. American tradition decrees that for the latter usually they shall receive merely reimbursement for actual expenses. The assumption is that the salaries paid faculty members by educational institutions are compensation not only for time spent in teaching and administration but also in research. This assumption would be reasonable if the salaries were more nearly adequate for maintenance of the standard of living expected of professional men; it becomes ludicrous when it permits and even compels supplementary employment in scientifically unproductive pursuits to the detriment of research.

One of the barriers to research most commonly mentioned by social scientists, the need of subsidies for research, may actually be secondary to the conditions of academic employment just described. While the funds already available for research are far from ample, they can not now be expended with maximum effectiveness; and there is every reason to believe that more funds could be found if more high-grade research men were free to use them. The fundamental problem is not so much financial as cultural; it is an aspect of the prevailing pattern of academic life and work. There is too great a tendency to regard research as a leisure-time activity and too much interference with research interests by other duties with a higher priority, to encourage scientific investigation by faculty personnel or to permit the degree of application and continuity which is imperative.

Some social scientists are skeptical about the position, here taken, that research preeminence will long remain with the individual investigator working alone or with limited technical and clerical assistance. Whatever the ultimate relative roles of individual and cooperative research in the social sciences, there is no argument about the compelling need for improving the working conditions of academic research personnel, the group which includes nearly all lone investigators. This is

largely a matter for action by universities, and requires both general reconsideration of faculty functions and definite provision of adequate research facilities.

TYPES OF UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

That social scientists and university administrators have seen the advantages of organizing units specifically for research within their academic institutions can be inferred from the establishment of so many different university research agencies that they practically defy generalized description. In the creation of operating facilities for research requiring cooperative procedures more complex than those of individual workers and their few assistants, universities have adopted nearly every administrative device imaginable.

Some university research agencies restrict themselves largely or even exclusively to aiding faculty members in their own individual projects. These agencies nearly always take the form of faculty committees and are in essence administrative arms of the university. A committee of this kind, which operates simply by meeting more or less regularly for policy formulation and decisions on the merits of individual projects, is far less constructive in its influence on research than one which has the guidance and aid of a man to whom responsibility for the success of its operation has been definitely assigned as an important part of his official duties. A second type of university research organization is concerned with the planning and execution of a program restricted to a selected area of investigation. Closely related to this group of agencies are a number of university centers concentrating on selected geographical areas. A third category of university research agencies comprises those which engage in the planning and conduct of research without restriction to a single selected area of investigation.

It must be emphasized that these suggested categories of university research agencies frequently are not as distinguishable as they have been made to appear in the interest of brevity. The organizations with the broadest responsibilities sometimes concentrate heavily upon specialized programs while also helping individuals in their own work. The difference is primarily one of focus rather than of strict limitation, and this may be counted as a strong advantage for academic agencies because of the consequent flexibility in adapting procedures to research needs as they become evident. Where little more than distribution of funds for projects is involved, a faculty committee is the usual instrumentality, and there is a tendency to assume that only slight and casual administrative aid is needed, if any. In the very few universities which have undertaken constructive work

in connection with distribution of research funds to individuals by arranging for research planning and counsel, and provision of common facilities such as statistical machines and technicians, the results have been excellent. The success of these few exceptions to the general rule of merely granting or refusing requests emphasizes the weaknesses of the simple allocation system of research support. The recent tendency is toward increased administrative assistance.

Agencies with planned programs in either specialized or broad areas naturally have more adequate administrative arrangements than those primarily concerned with fund allocation. Here one finds research directors, administrative assistants, advisory committees, boards of directors and other aids in all conceivable proportions. There are those who complain that in some of these agencies too much money is diverted from research to administration, but the evidence seems clear that large-scale projects require expenditure of considerable time and money for administration if they are to be operated efficiently while even the lone worker can be assisted by adequate administrative aid and protection.

FINANCING OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH

The funds available to university research units are derived from a variety of sources and may be either entirely free for expenditure according to the judgment of academic minds or restricted to narrow fields or even specific projects. Philanthropic grants by foundations and individuals are probably still the main source of support for university research in the social sciences. The major universities and some colleges have accepted the principle that the financing of research is a proper charge against their resources, and their budgets regularly provide some money for this purpose. The total amount from this source remains relatively small, however, particularly in comparison with the much more ample funds for research in the natural sciences which have long been provided by universities. In very recent years institutional acceptance of the obligation to make budgetary appropriations for social research has increased noticeably, and one may at least hope that as university finances permit, such appropriations eventually will become more customary and more ample.

There is reason to anticipate a significant increase in grants to universities for social science by business and industry and by government. These sources have contributed large sums to the natural sciences for many years, and the practice has been greatly extended in consequence of the scientific and engineering successes during World War II. Thus far, corporations have given comparatively little directly for social science research. However, the increasing concern of business

men and industrialists with human problems is evidenced by their words, the employment of greater and greater numbers of persons trained in social science, and by personal gifts for economic and other social research, and together with the growing recognition of its practical value, gives assurance that more money may be expected from this source. As for the government, it may be observed that state and municipal institutions already are receiving public funds for research in all fields and that the federal government established a precedent shortly after World War I by its relatively large appropriations for research in agricultural economics and rural sociology at land grant colleges and universities. Some of the anticipated money from these two sources, perhaps too much, undoubtedly will be made available through contracts for definite projects, but in all probability a good proportion of it will be free for expenditure over broad fields in accordance with the judgment of research leaders. Confidence that the independence and freedom essential to scientific research can and will be maintained, in spite of fears that private interests of donors and political considerations may have harmful influence, is gained from the past record of universities and their research staffs: consistently and with but few exceptions they have refused to accept funds for research in any field without guarantees of full liberty in investigation.

ROLE OF THE SSRC IN IMPROVING RESEARCH

While specific remedial measures are and must remain primarily a responsibility of the institutions of higher education, the Social Science Research Council must be and is actively concerned with all the factors which assist or hamper the development of favorable attitudes and effective facilities with respect to the improvement of research in the social sciences. The one simple purpose of the Council is the improvement of knowledge concerning human relations. This, of course, is the purpose of all organizations working in the social sciences and, indeed, of all social scientists. The particular role of the Council, however, is that of a central agency to promote the unity of effort in attacking social problems which is required to assure maximum returns from the work of a multitude of individual social scientists and of independent private and public institutions.

The Council is convinced, of course, of the necessity for maintaining the freedom characteristic of research in the United States, and consequently does not attempt to operate as a coordinating agency in any compulsive sense. It is rather a facilitating agency, and serves individual scientists, research institutions, universities, foundations, the government, and the public in such varying capacities as a research planning agency, a clear-

ing house, liaison agent, advocate, critic, a means of supporting strategically selected projects, a source of advice on personnel, and at times as an operator of urgent projects. In short, there is nothing the Council does not stand ready to do if feasible in the interest of research in the social sciences, provided that freedom of inquiry is maintained and that there is no other responsible institution available for the task. A simple classification of its objectives divides them into those designed to improve the quality of research, those undertaken for the prompt extension of knowledge of problems in human relations, and those intended to improve the situation of social science and social scientists.

The quality of research may be said to depend most directly on the quality and training of research personnel, the accessibility of adequate data, and the suitability of research plans and methods. The Social Science Research Council has been concerned with all these problems since its inception. The extension of knowledge of human relations is promoted by the Council through the planning of research in selected areas judged ready for development, through the designing and appraisal of specific projects, through the stimulation of research under other auspices, and, when no other suitable agency is available, through the direct operation of projects of pressing importance. The Council's direct concern with the conditions of research has been evidenced in its attention to dissemination of results of research for the purpose of increasing public appreciation and utilization, to problems in the relation of government and research, to organizational problems affecting efficiency of operation, and to matters of finance. Greatest emphasis has been on the development of better personnel and of improved ways of working. The current postwar situation requires continued and increased efforts to raise the level of social science research and at the same time demands new and far greater attention, on the part of the Council and all other organizations concerned with the better understanding of social behavior, to the facilities and circumstances which although beyond the direct control of social scientists can speed or retard their potential contributions to society.

CONDITIONS NEEDING IMPROVEMENT

Both social scientists and lay critics have been heard to say that the way to improve the situation of the social sciences is by improving the social sciences—a trite and superficial statement. Of course, the status and opportunities of social research are largely dependent upon the kind of people engaged in it, their skills and techniques, and their accomplishments. It should be equally obvious that the reverse is also true. The inter-

dependence of research achievement and the milieu of research is so complex that a one-sided approach is illogical. Students of social relations have had to assume the burden of convincing their fellows of the validity of their faith that human behavior is not capricious, and that it is therefore subject to orderly scientific analysis with reasonable expectation that generalizations of predictive value can be discovered. This was demonstrable to those willing to weigh the evidence long before the present decade. The records of social scientists and their products during World War II, both within the United Nations and among the Axis Powers, together with their contributions to the resolution of economic and social problems in more peaceful times make it impossible for society as a whole to escape its share of responsibility for full support of research which yields more and more knowledge about the factors which determine the way people behave.

The conditions under which social scientists labor which are at most only partially under their own control and which now demand conscious study and improvement through organized efforts include:

1. Public misunderstanding of the nature, accomplishments, and potentialities of the social sciences as practical means for gaining knowledge useful in meeting problems of community, national, and world relations.
2. Government neglect and inadequate support of social science research as a tool in the exercise of its functions.
3. Lack of satisfactory communication and cooperation between social scientists separated by disciplinary distinctions, geographical isolation within the United States, and the international barriers of distance, diverse cultures, and antagonistic loyalties.
4. The varied pattern of research organization within universities, privately operated agencies without academic sponsorship, and other units within business and government, which has developed haphazardly with little attention and no responsible study designed to extract the lessons of experience and furnish the basis for improvement.
5. Financial support which is inadequate in amount and inefficiently allocated.

Neither the ordinary private donor nor the average government official with funds for expenditure on research seems able and willing to find competent social scientists and trust them with the selection of projects. Not only do laymen decide what areas of social research are to be well financed—a reasonable prerogative of donors and public officials—but, with notable exceptions including the larger and well established foundations, they also decide on the relative merits of

professional personnel, specific projects for investigation, and methods of procedure.

6. Confusion between the functions of social research and social engineering which is disadvantageous to both.

Graduate training in the social sciences rarely distinguishes between students preparing for research careers and those looking forward to careers in teaching or other occupations where knowledge of a social science may be useful. Social scientists themselves too frequently accept without question a dual role as scientist and practitioner without full awareness of the distinction between the two, although there is little reason to assume that a man well trained and skillful in the one profession necessarily will be adept in the other.

This list of conditions adverse to the rapid and effective development of the social sciences in the United States today should perhaps be balanced by a parallel list of opposing favorable circumstances, to prevent conveying an unintended pessimistic view. It has, however, seemed preferable to focus attention on the handicaps to be overcome, taking it for granted that there will be

general agreement with the underlying belief that the total situation is favorable for the social scientist and that the limiting factors are not beyond reasonable correction. Social scientists steadily have improved their techniques; their results carry more and more conviction to themselves and to the public because of increasingly objective and skillful methods of approach; the social utility of their findings has been extended; funds for the support of their work have been increased beyond expectation; demand for their services has outgrown the supply of trained personnel; and the public is eager to believe that science can give mastery over the problems of men as over inanimate materials. The danger is that preoccupation, overconfidence, and inadequate organization may permit too casual attention to the necessity for taking positive measures to assure recognition and understanding of the potentialities and needs of the social sciences in a society whose leaders, if not the rank and file, are already acknowledging the advantages of an objective, analytical approach to many of its problems.

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CANADIAN

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

by A. T. Poffenberger

THERE are three research Councils in Canada, the Canadian National Research Council, the Canadian Social Science Research Council, and the Humanities Research Council of Canada. The first of these is best known to people in the United States, through its conspicuous activities during the war, but the other two are no less active in the promotion of research. The areas which they cover and their general form of organization resemble those of the similarly named Councils in the United States.

The 1947 annual meeting of the Social Science Research Council took place in Quebec on May 24-25. The sessions were held in one of the historic buildings of Laval University. They were under the chairmanship of Harold A. Innis, Professor of Political Economy at the University of Toronto, who is a director of our own Council, designated by the American Economic Association. One of the sessions was held jointly with the Humanities Research Council, which was meeting simultaneously in Quebec, and whose chairman is an ex officio member of the Canadian SSRC.

The Council has four so-called sponsoring bodies, each of which elects one "representative member." These are the Canadian Historical Association, the Canadian Committee of the International Geographical Union, the Canadian Political Science Association, and the Canadian Psychological Association. It will be noted that there are no economic, sociological, or anthropological sponsoring groups. In Canada these disciplines are comprised within the membership of the Political Science Association and may be represented on the Council either through that Association or through the Council's members at large. The constitution provides that not more than eight such members shall be appointed by the Council, and they are generally chosen from those disciplines which at any time are not represented by way of a sponsoring group. In addition to the sponsored members and the members at large, there is a non-voting associate membership of four persons, who are appointed by the Council from among dominion and provincial government officials. With the one ex officio member mentioned earlier, this

provides a working body of 17 members, considerably smaller than that of our own Council.

The main subject of the several sessions was social science personnel. The personnel problems that the Canadian social scientists have to meet are very similar to our own. There is, first of all, the question of how to deal with the great influx of students into the more advanced courses since the close of the war, with the consequent problem of space and overloading of teachers. It seemed to be the general impression that in Canada the increase of student enrollment had about reached its peak, whereas in this country that may not occur for several years. Still, there is much concern over the loss of opportunity for research by those persons most competent to do it. The joint session with the Humanities Research Council dealt with this problem.

Several remedies were suggested and subjected to critical examination. One of these was that many of the smaller institutions not now serving advanced students in the social sciences be encouraged to do so, thereby relieving the pressure upon the few largest universities. The obvious danger was noted, namely, that general scholarly standards of achievement might be lowered if institutions not adequate to the task either in staff or in facilities were encouraged thus to enlarge their offerings. A careful choice of institutions, it was believed, could considerably reduce the risk.

Another remedy discussed at length was the provision of larger numbers of teaching fellows or teaching assistants to give the more elementary courses, leaving those capable of advanced instruction and research more time and energy to spend in these pursuits. Such a plan would merely be an extension of what is already being done in many institutions. It does have its disadvantages, however, when carried too far since it weakens instruction at what may well be a critical level with respect to eventual research potentiality.

A third suggestion, not entirely novel in the larger Canadian universities, was that free time for research be given those most able or most promising, in the form of a leave of absence from regular duties for a quarter year, half year, or year. The problems of financing and of providing substitutes in the less favored institutions are the obstacles to this course. This observer gained the impression that efforts would be made to encourage the use of one or all of these devices where they could reasonably be expected to work.

The second large question concerning personnel was how to encourage and give financial support to those advanced students who offered most promise of productive research careers. The usual teaching fellowships that have served this purpose over the years are less likely to do so with the heavy load now resting upon

teaching staff everywhere. After critical discussion of possible courses of action, it was decided to embark upon a program of social science fellowships. It was proposed to begin on a modest scale and with the minimum of administrative machinery. Information will be sought from the various research fellowship programs in the United States in order to profit as much as possible from their experience. Award of no more than about five fellowships was contemplated for the first year or so. No search would be necessary to find good candidates for the fellowships, as such persons are well known to Canadian social scientists and are eager to accept fellowship support. The advanced students attending a few of the larger universities would undoubtedly have the advantage in fellowship awards over those at more obscure institutions although the latter might be equally promising. To seek these out is a laborious process, as the fellowship committee of our own Council has long since discovered. An incidental effect of establishing Canadian social science fellowships would be to encourage good men to obtain their research training in Canada and to remain there to work on the many Canadian problems, rather than to be drawn off by way of fellowships in the United States. The fellowship program should be accompanied by a concerted effort to provide attractive permanent positions for such well trained research men, in academic institutions, in industry, and in government.

Research projects presented for approval and support of the Council were sympathetically but critically examined. The most comprehensive of these programs was submitted by the committee on Indian research and contained 16 separate proposals, each with a statement of the problem, the research staff, and a tentative budget, the total for the whole being about \$40,000.

In the United States, the operations of the Social Science Research Council have had to span wide geographical and cultural areas. In its efforts to advance social science research throughout the country, the Council has experimented with a Pacific Coast Regional Committee and a Southern Regional Committee, and during the past year has found advantages in the maintenance of a Pacific Coast representative. The Canadian Council, comprising scientists from Newfoundland to British Columbia and representing the educational and research institutions in the Maritime, French Canadian, Central, and Western provinces, gives the impression of embracing a far greater range of variation both geographical and cultural. The coordination of these scattered and diverse forces in the interest of social science is one of the most challenging and important tasks facing the Canadian Social Science Research Council.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING RESEARCH

Frederick V. Waugh (chairman), John D. Black, A. C. Hoffman, Theodore W. Schultz, H. M. Southworth, Leland Spencer, F. J. Welch, H. R. Wellman; *staff*, R. G. Bressler, Jr.

By July 1 Mr. Bressler had defined the scope and major phases of the appraisal and planning project in agricultural marketing research, which he will carry out during the coming year. Group conferences with committee members and other agricultural economists have contributed to the development of the project's content and procedure. According to a tentative outline the following subjects will be treated as the major divisions of the study: (1) a general consideration of the aims and status of research in this field, (2) marketing as a phase of production, (3) imperfections and monopoly elements in marketing, (4) consumption and demand, (5) the perfect market in time and space, (6) marketing as part of the national and world economy, and (7) the relation of research findings to action programs. At a meeting on July 22 this outline was reviewed by the committee. Mr. Bressler is preparing a preliminary draft of the section on research objectives and status.

CONFERENCE BOARD OF ASSOCIATED RESEARCH COUNCILS

(Joint with the American Council on Education, American Council of Learned Societies, and National Research Council)

Ross G. Harrison (chairman), Donald Young (secretary), Detlev W. Bronk, W. Norman Brown, Aaron J. Brumbaugh, A. T. Poffenberger, Richard H. Shryock, George F. Zook.

The Conference Board has initiated the first phase of a program of inquiry and action relating to scientific and scholarly personnel problems. This step had its origin in a statement from the board's Committee on Specialized Personnel contending that existing shortages of superior and highly trained personnel will be aggravated by current endeavors to earmark the best high school graduates for training in particular directions. It was pointed out that the postwar officer training programs of the armed services are likely to be paralleled by analogous scholarship and fellowship programs for specific civilian purposes. Under these circumstances many important scientific, scholarly, and professional activities will find themselves disadvantaged in competing for a suitable proportion of the young men and women competent to make significant intellectual contributions. With the unanimous and earnest support of representatives of each of the four Councils the Conference Board agreed to undertake the organization and supervision of a program having two objectives: (1) assembly or development of factual data regarding the supply of and

demand for personnel of superior quality in all fields in which this is especially important for the national welfare, and (2) development of positive steps to bring about a better balance in the recruiting and use of key personnel in various fields of intellectual activity.

Funds for the initial phase of this program have been granted by the Rockefeller Foundation. It is contemplated that within a few months an exploratory study will define further the problems requiring decision and determine the specific points at which factual inquiry is necessary as well as the procedures by which this can be carried forward. On the basis of the initial inquiry the Conference Board hopes to propose a more substantial program possibly extending over a span of several years.

With regard to one special phase of this over-all problem, the Conference Board has approved in principle and referred to the individual Councils a statement of "Suggested Policy Principles Underlying Future Roster Activities." This reads as follows:

1. The collection and maintenance of information on personnel in fields requiring a high degree of specialized competence will probably be a matter of increasing rather than of decreasing importance in the future.

2. Experience with large-scale efforts to register indiscriminately all persons with some specialized training or experience seems to indicate that such efforts are impractical and uneconomical. To be successful a roster activity should be sufficiently selective so that continued financial support is reasonably certain, registration is complete, and information current.

3. There is an important role for a central office. It should have the following functions:

- a. Maintain a highly selective roster of personnel in each field.

- b. Assist scientific, learned and professional societies in the collection of personnel information.

- c. Stimulate the collection of such information in inadequately organized areas.

- d. Furnish financial or other assistance when important areas do not have adequate resources.

- e. Carry on research on and cooperate in continuous studies of the supply of and the demand for personnel in relation to national requirements.

4. The support of a central office should be such as to insure continuity of its functions. This probably means that federal funds should be available and that the central office should be a part of such an agency as the proposed national science foundation. It does not follow that the federal agency would or should itself carry on all of the activities contemplated above. Many of the functions might be carried out by contract with scientific and professional organizations. Cooperation with scientific and learned societies would be facilitated if the activities are carried out by non-

governmental organizations wherever this promises satisfactory results. It should not be forgotten that personnel information of this kind has implications of control. The scientific and learned professions will feel greater assurance about these activities if they are kept within the guidance of scientific groups.

This statement is based in part on conclusions reached from examination of the report to the Committee on Specialized Personnel, prepared by Lowell H. Hattery, on *Practices in Collection and Maintenance of Information on Highly Trained and Specialized Personnel in the United States*, published for the committee by the National Research Council in June.

ECONOMIC HISTORY

Arthur H. Cole (chairman), Earl J. Hamilton, Herbert Heaton, John G. B. Hutchins, Harold A. Innis, Leland H. Jenks, Edward C. Kirkland, Frederic C. Lane, Robert Warren.

With one volume on the role of government in the American economy just published and a second number of the same series in press, the committee's schedule of publications continues to expand. A second manuscript in the field of entrepreneurial history—in addition to Warren C. Scoville's analysis of the revolution in the glass industry—is ready for printing, namely, a study of the promotional activities of William Blackmore in the American Southwest by Herbert O. Brayer of the University of Denver. A third volume concerned primarily with the actions of entrepreneurs, a report on transportation developments in New England during the nineteenth century by Edward C. Kirkland of Bowdoin College, will also be published by the committee as an appropriate member of its series, even though not prepared under its auspices.

GOVERNMENT RECORDS AND RESEARCH

James W. Fesler (chairman), Patterson H. French, Lincoln Gordon, Richard B. Heflebower, Louis C. Hunter, Lester S. Kellogg, Harold B. Rowe, T. J. Woofter, Jr.

In addition to its promotion of the declassification of war records and advisory services to government agencies concerning the use of their records in social research, the chairman of the committee reports that it "has been active in making better known among research workers in the social sciences the availability and usefulness of government records suitable for research purposes. It has urged the research committees of the social science societies to undertake the task of bringing the usefulness of government records to the attention of members of their associations. The committee has initiated a project for the preparation of a guide to the use of government records by social scientists. The guide will be intended for use in graduate schools and by scholars undertaking research projects."

HOUSING RESEARCH

Richard U. Ratcliff (chairman), Howard G. Brunsman, Nicholas J. Demerath, Ernest M. Fisher, John M. Gaus, Robert B. Mitchell, Arthur M. Weimer, Louis Wirth, Coleman Woodbury; *staff*, Gerald Breese.

At a meeting of the committee on July 7-9 the organization of a series of research planning monographs was discussed in terms of coverage, number, and prospective assignment, and subcommittees were appointed for the preliminary outlining of such monographs. Attention was also given to development of training facilities for research scholars, the inclusion of sessions on housing in meetings of professional societies, and the general facilitation of research on housing.

LABOR MARKET RESEARCH

J. Douglas Brown (chairman), E. Wight Bakke, Philip M. Hauser, Clark Kerr, Gladys L. Palmer, Carroll L. Shartle, Dale Yoder; *staff*, Paul Webbink.

The committee and the Pacific Coast Committee on Labor Market Research held a conference on Pacific Coast labor research developments and plans on July 9-10 at the University of California at Berkeley. The conference represented a further step in integrating the work of these two Council committees and afforded an opportunity for discussion with representatives of West Coast universities concerning the committee's projected formulation of a collaborative program of studies of labor mobility. It is contemplated that the labor mobility project will involve the participation of several university research centers.

A summary of the discussion at the conference on wage research held at the Yale University Labor and Management Center in April, with appended suggestions for research, is in process of publication as Council Pamphlet 4, *Research on Wages* by Lloyd G. Reynolds. It is the second in a series of research planning documents scheduled by the committee. The first, Gladys L. Palmer's *Research Planning Memorandum on Labor Mobility*, was published as Council Pamphlet 2 in April. A third document, on the role of vocational counseling and placement services in relation to labor mobility and tenure, is now being prepared by Carroll L. Shartle.

The committee and the University of Minnesota jointly sponsored a third Conference on Industrial Relations Research and Training at Minneapolis on May 22-23. The conference again proved to be an effective instrumentality for the communication of plans and experience, and there was unanimous agreement that a fourth conference of the same type should be held in the spring of 1948. Increasing emphasis was placed in this year's discussions and in suggestions for the 1948 conference upon specific problems of research rather than upon the operating and teaching problems of the universities represented. The committee has again accepted responsibility for developing the detailed program and arrangements for the conference.

LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

(Joint with the American Council of Learned Societies and the National Research Council)

Lewis Hanke (chairman), Ralph L. Beals, William E. Berrien, Rene D'Harnoncourt, E. J. Kyle, Robert A. Lambert, George Sanchez, T. Lynn Smith, Alexander Wetmore.

The joint Committee on Latin American Studies, which was established in 1942, was discontinued on June 30 by action of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils. The board recorded its appreciation of the many contributions which the joint committee had made to war agencies concerned with Latin American matters, to the preparation and publication of bibliographic guides, and to the stimulation of studies of Latin American problems. It had not, however, been possible to determine the directions to be taken by any further program of the joint committee, and in the judgment of the Conference Board the coming year will be an opportune time for thorough reconsideration of the development and needs of the Latin American field. It was agreed that this task should be assigned to a small interim committee which will be appointed after consultation among the four Councils represented on the Conference Board. The new committee will be asked to prepare recommendations regarding future action by the board or by the individual Councils. Prior to its termination the joint committee, with the Conference Board's approval, arranged with the Harvard University Press for publication of the tenth and eleventh volumes of the *Handbook of Latin American Studies* which the committee had sponsored. The hope was expressed that through collaboration between Harvard University and the Library of Congress, annual issues of the *Handbook* may be continued indefinitely.

MEASUREMENT OF OPINION, ATTITUDES AND CONSUMER WANTS

(Joint with the National Research Council)

Samuel A. Stouffer (chairman), S. S. Wilks (vice-chairman), P. G. Agnew, Edward Battey, Hadley Cantril, Archibald M. Crossley, W. Edwards Deming, Robert F. Elder, George Gallup, Philip M. Hauser, Carl I. Hovland, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Rensis Likert, D. B. Lucas, Elmo Roper, Walter A. Shewhart, Frank Stanton, C. L. Warwick; staff, Elbridge Sibley, Frederick F. Stephan, Philip J. McCarthy.

The committee will be responsible for the supervision of a research program concerned with the isolation, measurement, and control of interviewer effect in attitude and opinion studies, for which the National Opinion Research Center has just received a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation for a two-year period beginning July 1, 1947. The proposed research program will be limited to interviewer effect on elicitation and recording of responses, since

bias in the selection of respondents is being treated in the committee's studies of sampling directed by Frederick F. Stephan and described in the June issue of *Items*. The NORC's studies will have as their ultimate aim the formulation of concrete recommendations concerning the development of (1) more reliable instruments for the objective selection of interviewers, (2) improved methods of training interviewers, (3) sound bases for the adaptation of questions to relevant variables in the light of known probabilities of bias associated with different forms and types of question, (4) techniques for the detection and measurement of unavoidable interviewer bias in any segment of data, (5) valid guides for instructing interviewers on the problems of specific surveys.

In the course of the project, plausible hypotheses as to interviewer bias will be tested by systematic analyses of existing data in the files of polling agencies, quasi-experimental questioning in regular surveys, and controlled experiments. It is expected that the results of the first two types of test will indicate the specific problems which warrant controlled investigation. Studies for which tentative procedures have already been outlined include investigations of the relation of bias in answers to question construction, to degree of crystallization of respondents' opinions, to the extent of emotional involvement on the part of interviewers, and to interviewers' knowledge of the sponsorship and purposes of a survey. With respect to sources of bias in the recording of responses, there will be a study dealing with the classification of ambiguous answers. A third series of studies will investigate general interviewer competence and the fourth will involve controlled observation of interviewer bias, to ascertain how it actually operates in the interview situation and the degree to which its operation is associated with various factors, as the basis for effective control.

ORGANIZATION FOR RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Louis Wirth (chairman), Gordon W. Blackwell, Frederick C. Mills, Stanley F. Teele, Donald H. Wallace, Malcolm Willey; staff, Paul Webbink.

In recent correspondence with persons closely involved with problems of research organization in the social sciences at some 50 universities and colleges, the committee raised a number of questions about conditions governing the acceptance of research contracts, especially with the armed services. For the immediate benefit of administrators and research workers facing this problem, a six-page mimeographed *Summary of Replies to an Inquiry Concerning University Practices Relating to the Appraisal of Research Contracts in the Social Sciences* has been issued by the committee. This document may be obtained from the Washington office of the Council, 726 Jackson Place, N. W.

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE ON LABOR MARKET RESEARCH

Clark Kerr (chairman), Paul A. Dodd, Maurice I. Gershenson, Robert D. Gray, William S. Hopkins, John P. Troxell.

Upon its reorganization a year ago the committee stated its major objectives as the coordination of research activities of the Pacific Coast institutes in its field; promotion of their exchange of research materials, establishment of uniform library systems, and exchange of standardized card files for purposes of cross-referencing among the institute libraries; encouragement of collection of comparable data by state labor departments; and stimulation of research through conferences and other arrangements. The committee maintains several subcommittees to aid it in accomplishing these objectives. Through their efforts and the committee's several meetings and conferences considerable progress has been made in effecting exchanges of research plans and source materials among the research institutes, a division of labor as to collection of types of documents, and a uniform system of library classification. At a meeting on May 12 the committee decided to issue a mimeographed memorandum describing the organization and research programs of the industrial relations institutes on the Coast. This memorandum is in process of preparation and will be available for national distribution.

SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT: SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADJUSTMENT IN OLD AGE

Robert J. Havighurst (chairman), E. W. Burgess, J. McV. Hunt, Robert R. Sears, Clark Tibbitts; staff, Glen Heathers.

The University of Chicago has received a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York for execution of the pilot study, planned by the Council's subcommittee, on aspects of adjustment to old age in a small urban community and adjacent rural areas. Mr. Albert Reiss of the Department of Sociology at Chicago will undertake the study beginning January 1, 1948.

SOURCE BOOK OF HISTORICAL STATISTICS

(Advisory to the Bureau of the Census)

J. Frederic Dewhurst (chairman), Shepard B. Clough, Arthur H. Cole, Morris A. Copeland, Ernest S. Griffith, Edward P. Hutchinson, Stacy May, Walter L. Mitchell, Jr., Amos E. Taylor, Harold F. Williamson; staff, A. Benjamin Handler.

The manuscript of the source book of historical series compiled during the past year in the Census Bureau was sent to the printer late in June. The volume should be ready for distribution by the end of the year under the title *Historical Statistics of the United States*. Like the *Statistical Abstract*, this volume is to become a regular Census Bureau publication, to be revised from time to time as sufficient additional or improved historical statistics be-

come available. The present volume will consist of about 300 large pages with 3,000 time series. About one third of the space will be devoted to text containing source notes, explanations, and qualifications of the individual series. The subjects covered are similar to those in the *Statistical Abstract*.

TECHNIQUES FOR REDUCING GROUP HOSTILITY

Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (chairman), Charles Dollard, Pendleton Herring, Carl I. Hovland.

The committee's first project was completed in August with publication of Council Bulletin 57, *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions: A Survey of Research on Problems of Ethnic, Racial, and Religious Group Relations* by Robin M. Williams, Jr. of Cornell University.

The committee at the request of UNESCO in June accepted responsibility for proposing significant research in the field of international tensions. With the assistance of Klaus E. Knorr of the Institute of International Studies at Yale University, the committee will prepare a memorandum outlining the tensions whose study is essential, the current status of relevant knowledge and research, and topics upon which research should be undertaken. The project should be completed early in the fall.

WAR STUDIES

Roy F. Nichols (chairman), Shepard B. Clough (executive secretary), James P. Baxter, 3rd, Pendleton Herring, Paul T. Homan, John A. Krout, Dael L. Wolfe, Donald Young, Ralph A. Young.

The committee's executive secretary has reported the completion of several studies planned by the committee. One of these, *The Farmer in the Second World War*, by Walter W. Wilcox of the University of Wisconsin, has just been published by the Iowa State College Press. This volume "tells the story of American agriculture during the war. It has already been adopted by several colleges for courses in agricultural economics." The reports of three other studies are in press: *Rebuilding the World Economy* by Norman S. Buchanan, formerly of the University of California and now of the Rockefeller Foundation, and Friedrich A. Lutz of Princeton University is an analysis of American foreign economic relations in recent times. It is being published by its sponsor, the Twentieth Century Fund. *Central Banking during the War Period* by Karl R. Bopp is also being published by its sponsor, the Federal Reserve System, with papers treating control of stock market credit and consumer credit and recent monetary policy. *War and Social Problems* by Francis E. Merrill of Dartmouth College is scheduled for fall publication by Harper & Brothers.

A study of the impact of the war upon American education by I. L. Kandel of Columbia University, sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies, is ready for printing. The first volume of an analysis of the dissemination of war information by Harold Gosnell of the Depart-

ment of State is complete and a second volume is in preparation.

WORLD AREA RESEARCH

Robert B. Hall (chairman), Ralph L. Beals, Wendell C. Bennett, W. Norman Brown, Donald C. McKay, Geroid T. Robinson, Walter L. Wright, Jr.; *staff*, Charles R. Wagley.

The committee is planning a major conference on problems of world area research and graduate training to be held in New York in the late fall. Charles R. Wagley of the Department of Anthropology at Columbia University, who has accepted appointment as part-time Council staff beginning in September, will assist the committee in developing and carrying out its program.

PUBLICATIONS

NEW SSRC BULLETINS AND PAMPHLETS

Labor Force Definition and Measurement: Recent Experience in the United States, Bulletin 56, prepared by Louis J. Ducoff and Margaret J. Hagood for the Subcommittee on Labor Force Statistics of the Committee on Labor Market Research. March 1947. Pp. 144. \$1.00.

The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions: A Survey of Research on Problems of Ethnic, Racial, and Religious Group Relations, Bulletin 57, by Robin M. Williams, Jr. August 1947. Pp. 164. \$1.75.

The Use of Personal Documents in Psychological Science, Bulletin 49, by Gordon W. Allport. 1942; second printing June 1947 (photolitho-printed reproduction). Pp. 229. \$1.50.

Research Planning Memorandum on Labor Mobility, Pamphlet 2, prepared by Gladys L. Palmer for the Committee on Labor Market Research. April 1947. Pp. 28. 25 cents.

Area Studies: With Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences, Pamphlet 3, by Robert B. Hall. May 1947. Pp. 96. \$1.00.

Research on Wages: Report of a Conference Held on April 4-5, 1947 at the Yale Labor and Management Center, Pamphlet 4, by Lloyd G. Reynolds. In press. Pp. c. 40. 50 cents.

All numbers in the Council's bulletin and pamphlet series are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

OTHER RECENT PUBLICATIONS

The Problem of Reducing Vulnerability to Atomic Bombs by Ansley J. Coale. Prepared under the direction of the Committee on Social Aspects of Atomic Energy. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947. Pp. 132. \$2.00.

Commonwealth: A Study of the Role of Government in the American Economy: Massachusetts, 1774-1861 by Oscar and Mary F. Handlin. Prepared under the direction of the Committee on Economic History. New York: New York University Press, 1947. Pp. 379. \$3.50.

The Farmer in the Second World War by Walter W. Wilcox. Prepared with the aid of the Committee on War Studies. Ames: Iowa State College Press, 1947. Pp. 422. \$4.00.

Public Reaction to the Atomic Bomb and World Affairs: A Nation-wide Survey of Attitudes and Information by Richard S. Crutchfield, Angus Campbell, Sylvia Eberhart, and Patricia Woodward. Prepared under the direction of a subcommittee of the Committee on Social Aspects of Atomic Energy. Ithaca: Cornell University, 1947. Pp. 314. Litho-printed. Limited free distribution from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Cornell University.

Handbook of Latin American Studies: 1943, No. 9 edited by Miron Burgin for the Library of Congress and the Committee on Latin American Studies. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946. Pp. 534. \$7.00.

Research in the American State Legislative Process by O. Douglas Weeks. Prepared under the auspices of the Council's former Committee on Public Administration and the Research Committee of the American Political Science Association. 1947. Pp. 50. Litho-printed. Limited free distribution from the Washington office of the SSRC, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION PAMPHLETS

A limited supply of five of the pamphlets issued by the Council's former Committee on Public Administration between 1939 and 1942 is still available. The following pamphlets can be purchased from the Washington office of the Council:

Research in Public Personnel Administration—Scope and Method by Leonard D. White (Revised Edition). 1942. Pp. 39. 50 cents.

Research in the Use of the Government Corporation—An Outline of Suggested Research Topics, Harvey Pinney, Reporter. 1940. Pp. 31. 50 cents.

Research in Employer-Employee Relations in the Public Service—An Outline of Suggested Research Topics, John J. Corson, Chairman of Special Committee. 1940. Pp. 35. 50 cents.

Research in Judicial Administration by Charles U. Samenow and others. 1942. Pp. 89. 75 cents.
The Administration of Public Tort Liability in Los Angeles, 1934-38 by Leon T. David and John F. Feldmeier. 1939. Pp. 67. \$1.00.

SOCIAL SECURITY PUBLICATIONS

Copies of certain of the monographs prepared by the Council's Committee on Social Security between 1936 and 1942 are still available for purchase from the New York office of the Council. These are:

Three Aspects of Labor Dynamics by W. S. Woytinsky. 1942. Pp. 263. \$2.50.
British Unemployment Programs, 1920-38 by Eveline M. Burns. 1941. Pp. 415. \$3.00.
The Federal Role in Unemployment Compensation Administration by Raymond C. Atkinson. 1941. Pp. 202. \$2.00.
Old Age Security: Social and Financial Trends by Margaret Grant. 1939. Pp. 274. \$2.50.
Social Insurance Coordination: An Analysis of German and British Organization by C. A. Kulp. 1939. Pp. 347. \$2.50.
Labor in the United States: Basic Statistics for Social Security by W. S. Woytinsky. 1939. Pp. 355. \$3.50.
Seven Years of Unemployment Relief in New Jersey, 1930-36 by Douglas H. MacNeil. 1938. Pp. 318. \$1.25.

The Washington office has a small supply of the pamphlets published between 1940 and 1943 by the former Committee on Social Security. These are:

Unemployment Insurance and Agricultural Labor in Great Britain, Pamphlet 2, by Wilbur J. Cohen. February 1940. Pp. 40. 50 cents.
An Exploratory Memorandum on Partial Unemployment Benefits in State Unemployment Compensation Systems, Pamphlet 4, by J. J. Joseph. May 1940. Pp. 116. 60 cents.
Social Insurance and Agriculture, Pamphlet 5, by William S. Hopkins. September 1940. Pp. 100. 50 cents.
Topics for Research Concerning Public Assistance Programs, Pamphlet 6, by John Charnow. February 1941. Pp. 80. 50 cents.
The Prospects for a Study of the Economic Effects of Payroll Taxes, Pamphlet 9, by Carl Shoup. November 1941. Pp. 80. 50 cents.
Dismissal Compensation and the War Economy, Pamphlet 7, by Everett D. Hawkins. January 1942. Pp. 88. 50 cents.
Work Relief Experience in the United States, Pamphlet 8, by John Charnow. February 1943. Pp. 150. 50 cents.

A few remaining copies of Pamphlets 1 and 3, *Additional Workers and the Volume of Unemployment in the Depression* by W. S. Woytinsky (January 1940) and *Methods of Clearance between Unemployment Compensation and Relief Agencies* by Arthur T. Jacobs (March 1940), are being reserved for purchasers of the complete set of pamphlets, at \$4.00 a set. A list of other incidental publications of the committee, of which varying quantities of copies are available, can be obtained from the Washington office.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors 1947: RALPH L. BEALS, WENDELL C. BENNETT, JAMES C. BONBRIGHT, E. W. BURGESS, SHEPARD B. CLOUGH, LEONARD S. COTTRELL, JR., JOSEPH S. DAVIS, J. FREDERIC DEWHURST, ELMER ELLIS, ROBERT B. HALL, SHELBY M. HARRISON, PENDLETON HERRING, HAROLD HOTELLING, CARL I. HOVLAND, CHARLES S. HYNEMAN, HAROLD A. INNIS, CHARLES E. MERRIAM, ROY F. NICHOLS, WILLARD C. OLSON, FREDERICK OSBORN, A. T. POFFENBERGER, ROBERT R. SEARS, JOSEPH J. SPENGLER, BLAIR STEWART, WILLIAM DUNCAN STRONG, WILLARD L. THORP, RALPH W. TYLER, DONALD YOUNG, KIMBALL YOUNG

Staff: DONALD YOUNG, *Executive Director*; PAUL WEBBINK, ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, GLEN HEATHERS, CHARLES R. WAGLEY, GERALD BREESE, ELEANOR C. ISBELL, HAROLD E. JONES, *Pacific Coast Representative*; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, *Controller*

72
1.
-
-
0.
-
0.
2
y
f